1 JUDGE THOMAS O. RICE Heather C. Yakely, WSBA #28848 2 Evans, Craven & Lackie, P.S. 3 818 W. Riverside, Suite 250 4 Spokane, WA 99201-0910 (509) 455-5200 5 hyakely@ecl-law.com 6 7 Attorney for Spokane County Defendants 8 9 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 12 13 14 JAMES LEIGHTY, No. 2:24-cv-00165-TOR 15 Plaintiffs, DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR 16 OVERLENGTH RE: 17 DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO VS. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR 18 SPOKANE COUNTY, a municipal PRELIMINARY INJUNCITON 19 corporation; SHERIFF JOHN 20 NOWELS, an individual; and Date: July 1, 2024 Without Oral Argument SPOKANE COUNTY 21 SHERIFF'S OFFICE, a subdivision 22 of a 23 municipal corporation, Defendants. 24 25 COME NOW Defendants Spokane County, Sheriff John Nowels, and 26 Spokane County Sheriff's Office, (hereafter collectively as "SCSO"), and 27 28 DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR OVERLENGTH 29 RESPONSE RE: DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO EVANS, CRAVEN PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY 30 & LACKIE. P.S. INJUCTION - page 1 818 W. Riverside, Suite 250

Spokane, WA 99201-0910

(509) 455-5200; fax (509) 455-3632

1 purs
2 Res
4 limi
5 from
7 limi
8 argu
10
11
12

pursuant to LCivR 7(f)(5), move the Court for an Order permitting SCSO's Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction to exceed the 10-page limitation as set forth in LCivR 7(f)(2). As explained below, SCSO seeks approval from the Court to exceed page limitation by 5 pages (5 pages over the 10-page limit) due to the length of Plaintiff's Opening Memorandum and the alternative arguments that must be addressed.

I. AUTHORITY AND ARGUMENT

Pursuant to LCivR 7(f)(2), states that non dispositive motions shall not exceed 10 pages, LCivR 7(f)(1) states that dispositive motion responses shall not exceed 20 pages and this page limit "may only be exceeded by obtaining prior approval of the Court. A motion to exceed page limits must demonstrate good cause and recite the opposing party's position." LCivR 7(f)(1)-(5). Plaintiffs do not object to up to an additional five pages of briefing per email from Plaintiff's Counsel, Joe Shaeffer.

Preliminary injunctions are often treated as dispositive motions in determining the applicable rule for lengths of briefs. *Pac. Aero. & Elecs., Inc. v. Taylor*, 295 F.Supp. 2d 1188, 1204 n.29 (E.D. Wash. 2003) Preliminary injunctions addressing constitutional violations may also require more lengthy

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR OVERLENGTH RESPONSE RE: DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUCTION - page 2



arguments. *Baird v. Bonta*, 8 1 F.4th 1036, 1042 (9th Cir. 2023)(internal citations omitted). Nonetheless, because the rule is not clear as to preliminary injunctions, Defendants request an additional 5 pages of argument.

J

II. ARGUMENT

A. This Preliminary Injunction Analysis Require Numerous Subparts Including Constitutional Analysis and the Proper Forum.

Defendants' Response must address not just the facts raised in Mr. Leighty's 60-page declaration and Mika Rothman's 49-page declaration but also the standard for Preliminary Injunctions, an analysis on what type of forum is at issue as well as an argument on the constitutional standard. The arguments were kept as short and concise as possible without being so brief as to be detrimental to Defendants.

The additional 5 pages is reasonable given the length of the briefing and the issues with their subparts that must be raised.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, SCSO respectfully requests approval from the Court to exceed page limitation by 5 pages (over the 10-page limit) due to the quantity and duplicity of Plaintiff's claims against SCSO.

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR OVERLENGTH RESPONSE RE: DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUCTION - page 3



1	DATED this 13 day of June 2024.	
2		
3		
4	E	EVANS, CRAVEN & LACKIE, P.S.
5		
6	<u>/</u>	s/Heather Yakely
7		IEATHER C. YAKELY, WSBA #28848
8		ttorney for Defendants 18 W. Riverside, Suite 250
9		pokane, WA 99201
10		509) 455-5200
11	<u>h</u>	yakely@ecl-law.com
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29	DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR OVERLENGTH RESPONSE RE: DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO	
30	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY	& LACKIE DS

INJUCTION - page 4



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 13, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Braden Pence
Mika K. Rothman

Joseph R. Shaeffer

Email: <u>bradenp@mhb.com</u>
Email: <u>mikar@mhb.com</u>
Email: joe@mhb.com

Savannah Youmans, Legal Assistant

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR OVERLENGTH RESPONSE RE: DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUCTION - page 5

